

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. APPLN. NO. 09/462,206

**REMARKS**

**N.B.** Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner, in his next communication, to acknowledge Applicant's claim for foreign priority and receipt of the certified priority document (which Private PAIR shows is in the Examiner's file).

Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the disclosure in view of the enclosed corrected Abstract of the Disclosure, and the above amendments inserting the headings in the specification.

Applicant respectfully **traverses** the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over NYSTROM '334 in view of ONO (JP '063). The above amendments are made only to correct informalities in claim language, **not** to overcome the prior art rejection.

The Examiner contends that NYSTROM discloses in lines 35-36, col. 2 (presumably the left column of page 2), the claimed "method of welding two sheets (11, 12) along a zone of overlap".

Actually, these "lines" relate to the connection of only two sheets 12, **not** to the connection of a sheet 11 with a sheet 12.

Moreover, the connection of the two sheets 12 is made through abutment, **not** through overlapping ("*...the intermediate sheet 12 extends...where it abuts the next section...*").

The connection between the sheets 11 and 12 is described in lines 9-14, right column of page 2. According to these lines, those sheets are arc-welded, and, therefore, an electrode presses against each side of the overlapping zone of sheets 11 and 12.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. APPLN. NO. 09/462,206

Thus, NYSTROM's corresponding welding method does not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed step of "placing the sheets one above another...such that at least one region of the sheet projects "cantilever fashion", into the zone of overlap"; in fact, there is the claimed "pressing mechanism" on each side of the zone of overlap.

ONO relates to the welding of only very specific parts, i.e., a titanium plate with a titanium cladded steel plate. The goal is to reduce the spacing between the titanium plate and the titanium cladded steel plate to avoid corrosion and cracks.

Therefore, there would be **no motivation** to use the method of ONO in NYSTROM, since NYSTROM does not use the specific metallic elements disclosed in ONO.

In any event, ONO does not teach or suggest welding two plates by placing a region of an overlap zone in "cantilever fashion", as required in independent parent claim 8. Furthermore, such a feature is not contemplated in ONO, since none of the plates is provided with "stiffening" means "to resist the bending" of "the cantilevered region". Actually, the plates in overlap relation certainly are placed on a support extending along the whole overlapping zone.

Therefore, the combination of NYSTROM and ONO would not have (and could not have) taught or even suggested, to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art, that at least a region of the overlap zone should be made so that it "projects, "cantilever fashion"", as recited in claim 8.

Since the combined disclosures of NYSTROM and ONO do not teach (or even suggest) all of the limitations of the independent parent claim 8, Applicant respectfully submits that subject matter of claim 8 (and, by definition, of its dependent claims 2-6), would not have (and

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. APPLN. NO. 09/462,206

could not have) rendered obvious the subject matter of claims 2-8. Furthermore, and as is clear from the above analysis of NYSTROM and ONO, even if, for some reason, a person were to attempt to combine the teachings of NYSTROM and ONO, there would not be produced the subject matter of claim 8 and of its dependent claims 2-7.

In summary, then, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objections to the disclosure and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and to find the application to be in condition for allowance with **claims 2-8**; however, if for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to **call the undersigned attorney** to discuss any unresolved issues and to expedite the disposition of the application.

Applicant files concurrently herewith a Petition (with fee) for an Extension of Time of One Month. Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fee for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and/or § 1.17 necessary to keep this application pending in the Patent and Trademark Office or credit any overpayment to said Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213  
(202) 663-7901

/John H. Mion/

John H. Mion  
Registration No. 18,879

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 24, 2006